

UNDERSTANDING THE GENESIS OF INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Mangesh H. Kadam

Assistant Professor-cum-Assistant Director (Social Sciences)

SNDT Women's University, Mumbai

Maharashtra-400049

India was ruled by Britishers for more than 150 years. The newly independent state those who got independence after India and mostly after World War-II were struggling to develop their own administrative structure along with newly developed modern political institutions. The genesis of the administrative system in ancient times dates back to the Arthashastra of Kautilya it is also correlated to the administration of the Mauryan empire. the Kautilya's Arthashastra, description of state and its administrative apparatus is understood to be a relatively fair articulation of the state of affairs as prevailed in ancient times. According to Kautilya, the system of governance prevailing in ancient times was monarchy in which the king, called Swami, was the epitome of the state and its administrative system. The state consisted of seven prakritis or organs like the Swami (the king), the Amatya (the minister), the Janapada (the territory with the settlements of the people), the Durga (the fortified capital), the Kosha (the treasury), the Danda (the army), and the Mitra (the ally or the friend). These seven organs, in fact, reflect the conception of state and administration being taken as an inseparable entity which fostered the existence of the state itself. The nomenclature of a number of officers functioning at the time of Mauryan Empire still continues to be used for the officers performing, more or less, the same type of activities in present times also.

The Mughal rulers, mainly Akbar, brought about an amalgamation of the administrative system prevalent in the country with his own perspectives and innovations in the field in order to revolve a unique administrative system in the country which was typically Mughal. This administrative structure, called the Perso-Arabic system in the Indian setting, was rooted in the personality of the king and based on the strength of the military.

The foundational figure in the Mughal administrative system was the king in whose personality resided the sovereignty of the kingdom and from whom flowed all the powers and functions of the state. The king's principal mode of conveying his decisions was the declaration of farmans issued under his seal. Though bestowed with the despotic powers, the king used to carry out his administrative responsibilities in a somewhat decentralized manner through his trusted lieutenants called Wazirs and Diwans. These officials were more in the nature of personal advisors to the king rather than holding any formal seat of authority in the administrative set-up and therefore, their advices to the king were only optional, to be accepted only in case of the concurrence of the king. Hence, scholars called them as secretaries rather than ministers with little or no influence upon

the policy decisions of the king except for feeble prodding and a very mild precautionary advice.

The basic aspects of the administrative system functioning during the Mughal period were divided into departments under the headship of certain high officials of the empire. However, the appointment of various officials as the head of different departments was not in conformity with some sound principles of personnel administration but on the basis of the sweet will of the king and on the basis of the mansab held by an officer. **Mansab** was a typical notion of the Mughal administration, drawn from the military vocabulary and denoting the official designation of rank and profit of an officer who, in case of necessity, was required to supply a specified number of troops in the service of the king. Thus, the elite corps of officers of the Mughal administration consisted of the mansabdars of different ranks and may be called to be precursor of the mansabdars of different ranks and may be called to be precursor of the modern-day gazetted civil services. Each subah was an independent unit of governance during the Mughal period under the overall **incharge** of an official called the **subedar** entrusted with the task of what may be called as the law and order functions of the province. **Existing parallel to the Subedar, was the officer known as provincial diwan**, who was assigned with the specific task of revenue collection besides looking after the appointment of other officials of the province and maintenance of the provincial fort. The two officers were also authorized to make a number of appointment at the lower levels of the administration of the province in order to carry out their functions smoothly. Hence, while on the side of the subedar, his main assistant was the officer called **fauzdar**, the diwan was assisted by the officers called **amins, kroris and tahsildars**.

At local level the Mughal period saw the division of a subah into various administrative units called sarkars which were further divided down the line into different parganas (sub-division level), mawdahs (host of villages), and naglahs (small hamlet). These administrative units still exist in a number of states of the country, like Uttar Pradesh. Like the modern-day practice, the administration of the sarkar was divided into two broad heads: law and order, and the revenue collection. While fauzdar was in charge of the law and order, and the revenue collection was the responsibility of the officer called amin who was further assisted by the official khazandar in collecting money from the cultivators.

At the **pargana** level, shigar used to be the officer-in-charge, whose counterpart in the modern times is known as the parganadhikari. His chief assistants in the field were (and still are) known as qanungo, dealing with the survey, assessment, and collection of revenue. **Patwaris** were, and the lowest ranking revenue officials entrusted with the task of conducting the real ground-level activities in a village and listening to the grievances of the villagers on issues relating to the collection of revenue. During the Mughal period when the king used to remain confined to his palace, it was these officials from the level of shigar to that of patwaris who remained the reflection of the

king in the minds of the common people.

In present times with the arrival of democratic decentralization, though peoples representatives have become an important link between the government and the people, the officials with almost the same nomenclature have remained the backbone of the revenue administration of the government. The Mughal administration really provided the British with the base to build up an anglicized system of administration which was suitable to carry out the functions of the colonial state. Though the Mughal administrative set-up was marred by a number of shortcomings in terms of its structure, staffing pattern, and the functional dynamics, the credit needs to be given to the vision and endeavor of rulers of the time for at least conceptualizing and putting in place a system of administration which was able to hold the vastly expanded boundaries of the empire and provided a semblance of civilized life to the people by discounting any possibility of chaos and disorder in the society.

British administration:

The main motive of the arrival, establishment, and perpetuation of the British rule in India was unmistakably for exploitation of the country in order to maximize the profits of the British, in the course of their stay in India, they were able to bring about a number of marked innovations in the prevailing system of administration in the country and mould the administrative machinery of India in the frame of the administrative system prevalent in their own country.

Established in AD 1600, The East India Company was the monopolistic trading company interested primarily in the purchase of Indian goods and their sale in European countries. they remained a trading partner with India for more than 150 years, without showing any sign or inclination for territorial control over the country.

The Revolt of 1857 served as a jolt to the British government. There was widespread resentment against the company in Britain as the policies of the company were blamed for the revolt. Queen Victoria, who was the monarch of Britain, also became the sovereign of British territories in India, with the title “Empress of India” as a result of this Act. The British Parliament passed the Act of 1858. the British turned from a trading power to one of the most powerful countries in the world. East India Company was liquidated and Indian territories of Britain were to be governed in the name of the British Queen. The powers of the Company’s Court of Directors were vested with the Secretary of State for India. The Court of Directors and the Board of Control were scrapped.

The Secretary of State was to be a British MP and a member of the Prime Minister’s cabinet. He was to be assisted by a council of 15 members. He was also the channel of communication between the British government in Britain and the Indian administration.

The representative of the British government in India was the Governor-General and Viceroy

(both the same person to avoid conflict). The Viceroy and the governors of the various presidencies were appointed by the Crown. Britain was able to achieve tremendous feat on the backdrop of the strong and efficient bureaucracy that it established in its colonies. The Indian Civil Services was to be instituted for the administration of the country. the Decentralization and reasonable division of functions amongst the various functionaries of the government, introduced the portfolio system in Indian administration in 1859 Dividing the work of government into different branches with delimitation of the scope of activities of these branches, members of the governor-general' s council were made in charge of these branches.

With the Indian Council Act 1861 The provincial governments became totally subsidiary to the Council. The function of the Council limited to legislation and had no authority to control the executive though it empowered the provincial governments to legislate on provincial matters. The Executive Council was expanded to include the Advocate General of the provinces, in addition to four non- official members who were invariably Indians.

The most eventful development in this regard was undoubtedly the **1882 Ripon Resolution** that defended the introduction of the local self-government. It is chiefly desirable as an element of political and popular education. In pursuance of this goal, the 1885 Bengal Local Self-Government Act was adopted, which led to the forma-tion of district local boards in Bengal. **Royal Commission** was appointed in 1907 to look into the administration that seemed to have lost its viability in the context of growing discontent among the ruled. The aim of the Commission was to provide an administration which was adapted to the changed social, economic, and political realities of India. On the basis of the recommendation of the Commission, a Bill was introduced in 1908 which became the **1909 Morley-Minto Reforms**.

As a political scheme seeking to strengthen colonial rule in India, the Government of India Act, 1909 introduced a profound change with long-term effects in representation of communities In Councils. Once the Muslim League was founded in 1906 there were demands for 'separate electorate' for the Muslims on the basis of their numerical strength, political importance, and contribution which they made to the defense of the Empire. So the 1909 Act is remarkable in the history of representation in India. Muslims were recognized as a separate community and their electoral rights were also guaranteed accordingly. The adoption of the **1919 Montague-Chelmsford Reform** scheme which was guided by the committed goal of the government to increase association of the Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions in India. the British power in India that largely revolved around Governor-General-in-Council. So, dyarchy was very critical to conceptualizing the changing nature of public administration in British India at least in the first two decades of the twentieth century.

The 1935 Government of India Act, paved the way for a parliamentary form of government in which the executive was made accountable within certain bounds to the legislature. This had radically altered public administration in India, including the civil services in the country. Although the well-espoused federation never came into being, the Act was nonetheless a powerful comment against the integrated administrative system of the colonial variety.

In short The present Indian administrative structure is largely a legacy of British rule in India. Free India inherited governmental machinery, as developed by the British with the feel of significance accorded to having a federal government. All India Services, civil services recruitment, administrative training, the secretariat system, office procedures, district administration, revenue administration, police system, law and order, budgeting, accounting, auditing, and a number of other structural and functional areas of Indian administration have their roots in the British system.

Departmental organizations have been playing a dominant role in Indian administration system. The internal organization of the departments and their working procedures has not changed much. Hierarchy, written records, and communication have continued. Pre-independence manuals still govern these departments. The position of chief secretary in state administration continues even till today.

Another substantial contribution of the British rule was that the competitive examinations were conducted by an independent agency. The idea of a merit based civil service germinated on the Indian soil for the first time with the submission of the Macaulay Report in 1854. To ensure impartial selection of meritorious civil servants, the Federal Public Service Commission was established in 1926. This was replaced by Union Public Service Commission (UPSC) after the new Constitution of India came into force on 26th January, 1950. The authors of the Constitution not only vested it with a Constitutional Status, but also provided elaborate safeguards for maintenance of its independence to enable it to be the upholder of the merit system of personnel.

District is still continuing, as a unit of administration with noticeable increase in its importance. The head of the district administration continues to be the collector. However, the scale of operations at the district has more than doubled. The collector still enjoys the powers and status, as he used to, during the British rule. Now, apart from the regulatory functions like maintenance of law and order and revenue collection, the collectors are entrusted with the developmental functions for the development and growth of the respective districts.

Local government is yet another feature of the British administrative system that is being continued. Lord Ripon, who had introduced local self-government in India, has been

called the 'father of local self-government in India'. Local government institutions, which existed before independence, were consolidated and new ones were created to meet the growing needs of people. Laws have been passed for every state to have Municipal Corporations and Municipalities in the urban areas and village Panchayats in the rural areas.

The British administration created institutions like Comptroller and Auditor General, (C&AG), Public Accounts Committee, Reserve Bank, and a budget system for having a sound financial administration in government. These institutions are still playing a key role in government to ensure financial prudence and accountability. Now we will discuss the changes in the Indian administration system that was brought in by the new Constitution. 40 Evolution of Indian Administration.

Conclusion:

The new Constitution established Parliamentary Democracy in the country. Federal governance with the Union and state governments was established. Public Service Commissions were set up at the union and the state levels for ensuring selection of meritorious candidates. Directive Principles of State Policy and the fundamental rights and fundamental duties for the citizens were laid down. These and such other provisions increased the responsibilities of public administration in the country.

Administration was motivated more into trade and commercial activities that led to the surface of railways, posts and telegraphs, ports and highways, banking and insurance areas. The State is to strive to minimize the inequalities in income and eliminate inequalities in status, facilities, and opportunities to its citizens.

In the late fifties, panchayati raj has been the most significant channel of the participation of the rural people in the rural development administration.

In the past few decades, ICT has been increasingly used to improve government services. This kind of technology application to public system management is called e-governance. Various manifestations of **e-governance** initiatives are using IT tools and applications, such as computers and internet and also information systems like GIS, MIS, and such others. Digital India has also been launched to transform India into a digitally empowered society and knowledge economy.

Ever since the country became independent, Indian administration has continued with the British legacy by having erstwhile departmental organizations, public services, Public Service Commissions, the institution of District Collector, Reserve Bank, Comptroller and Auditor General, and such others. Along with this, the country introduced changes in Indian administration with a focus on citizens and pro-citizen services. Development and welfare became absolutely necessary with democracy and participation. Right to Information, local self-

government institutions, gender participation, citizens' charters, social audit, ICT, and such other measures are the traits of good governance that are today possible for the people of India.

References:

1. Chakrabarty Bidyut and Pandey Rajendra Kumar, "Indian Government and Politics" Sage publication, New Delhi, 2008.
 2. <http://egyankosh.ac.in/handle/123456789/68770>
- Avasthi, A. (1980). *Central Administration*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill .
 - *Government of India* . (2022, April 16). Retrieved April 20, 2022, from Cabinet Secretariat : <https://cabsec.gov.in/>
 - Kashyap, S. (2013). *Our Constitution* . New Delhi: National Book Trust .
 - Khera, S. S. (1964). *District Administration* . New Delhi: The Popular Press .
 - Laxmikant, M. (2011). *Public Administration*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publication.
 - Maheshwari, S. R. (1995). *Indian Administration*. New Delhi: Orient Longman, .
 - Mathur, K., & Mathur, N. (2017). Assessing Administrative Reform in India. *Chin. Polit. Sci. Rev.* , 40–55.



GOEIIRJ